DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 336 474 UD 028 228

AUTHOR Davidson, Mary E.; And Others
TITLE Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation's Observational Analysis of Project CANAL Training: Year 1 Core Planning Teams.
INSTITUTION Chicago Public Schools, IL. Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation.
PUB DATE Jan 90
NOTE 92p.; For a complete set of Commission Reports, see UD 028 213-233.
PUB TYPE Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Control; Compliance (Legal); *Desegregation Plans; Elementary Secondary Education; *Management Development; *Participative Decision Making; Program Evaluation; *School Based Management; *School Community Relationship; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Chicago Public Schools IL; Project CANAL

ABSTRACT

This evaluation summarizes an analysis of site observations of training sessions for the core planning teams of Project Creating a New Approach to Learning (CANAL), part of a court-mandated desegregation plan to reduce inequities in predominantly Black and Hispanic American schools in Chicago (Illinois). CANAL's goal is to train the core planning teams, composed of constituent representatives of the public schools, to engage in shared decision-making and to develop organizational structures that incorporate the community in the organizational and educational processes of the schools. The following overall findings are presented: (1) the core planning teams that attended the training sessions did not represent the school constituencies; (2) substantive variation in trainers and topics across all training sessions was evident; (3) project staff were not well prepared for the early sessions; (4) afternoon workshops, intended to build skills in team process, were the weakest part of training; (5) the preparation of training agendas was unclear and caused uneven training; (6) quality of training and training materials did not meet professional standards; (7) the training environment was poor and interfered with the quality of training; and (8) variation of conditions across teams was so dramatic that any hope of replicating Project CANAL would seem impossible. Statistical data are presented in 21 tables. (FMW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED336474

Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation

OBSERVATIONAL ANALYSIS OF PROJECT CANAL: YEAR 1 (1988-89)

Submitted to the United States Department of Education

January 1990

Mary E. Davidson
Principal Investigator

Donn F. Bailey
Commission Chairperson

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Monitoring Comm

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

UD 028 228

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Donn F. Bailey, Chairperson

Nancy M. Abbate	Jesse Miller
Maxine Duster	Uthman Muhammad
Mari Fohrman	Donnell Peterson
Carlos Heredia	George Riddick
Gwendolyn Laroche	Aida Sanchez
Henry Martinez	Darthula Young

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

Mary E. Davidson

COMMISSION STAFF

Barbara Anglin

Helen Jackson

Barb Leebens-Osilaja

Christy Spears

Ana Tapia

Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation
1819 West Pershing Road
6th Floor East
Chicago, Illinois 60609
(312) 890-8220

CONTACT PERSON:
Helen Jackson
(312) 890-8220

January 1990

AN EXECUTIVE ABSTRACT

Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation's

OBSERVATIONAL ANALYSIS OF PROJECT CANAL TRAINING: YEAR 1 CORE PLANNING TEAMS

The following is a summary of the analysis of observations made by the staff of the Monitoring Commission of Project CANAL training activities - Year 1 (1988-89).

o **ORIENTATION**

- Substantive variation in trainers that were used from one session to another was detrimental to the CANAL process. Some trainers appeared to be more conversant with the school-based management concepts than others.

- CANAL staff was ill-prepared for early training sessions, but improved from session to session.

- Variation in the quality of the training across the teams.

- Afternoon workshops were poorly organized, administered and monitored.

- Training environment was problematic at times (room temperature, noise and physical arrangement).

o **SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT TRAINING - DAY 1**

- Variation in trainers and topics that was observed in orientation continued during these training sessions.

- Group sessions continued to suffer from inadequate planning and monitoring by Project CANAL staff.

- Quality of education continued to be poor.

- Educational environment continued to be marginal in terms of disruptive events.

- **SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT TRAINING - DAY 2**

  - Variation of trainers and topics persisted.

  - Group sessions continued to suffer from the lack of "hand-on" experience closely monitored by CANAL staff.

  - Quality of training materials improved somewhat, but the educational environment continued to be problematic.

- **TOTAL SITE TRAINING - YEAR 1**

  - Variation in training was maximized when 26 different topics were presented by 12 different presenters distributed across 43 sessions.

  - Group session continued to fail to provide opportunities for core planning team members to put training concepts into practice.

- **YEAR 1 TRAINING OVERVIEW**

  - The core planning teams that showed up for training did not represent the school constituencies as outlined by the CANAL proposal.

  - Substantive variation in trainers and topics across all training sessions in Year 1.

  - State of preparation of Project CANAL staff was less than desirable. Later sessions had a better prepared program than earlier ones.

  - Afternoon workshops intending to build skills in team process were the weakest part of training.

  - A lack of clarity of how training agendas were prepared caused an unequal training experience for core planning teams.

  - Quality of training and training materials did not meet professional standards.

  - Management of the quality of educational environment was less than desirable and interfered with the quality of training.

  - Variation both between and within the core teams regarding team participants, presenters/trainers, topics and structuring character of work activities was so dramatic that any hope of replicating any aspect of Project CANAL would seem impossible.

This 79-page year-end observational progress report was completed under the direction of Dr. Mary E. Davidson, principal investigator, and primary consultant, Dr. Norman Kurtz. It has been submitted to the United States Department of Education. A reference copy is available at the Monitoring Commission office, 1819 W. Pershing Road, 6th Floor East, Chicago, IL 60609.

PREFACE

This is the fourth progress report done by the Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation to satisfy requirements of the $83 million Settlement Fund proposal. This report, written for the United States Department of Education, is the observational analysis of training activities of Project CANAL: Year 1 (1988-89).

The analysis was done under the direction of myself and the primary consultant, Dr. Norman R. Kurtz. On-site monitoring was done by Monitoring Commission staff personnel, Regina Horton, Barb Leebens-Osilaja, Jesse Qualls and Christy Spears. Other Commission staff who assisted in this report include Helen Jackson and Ana Tapia.

Mary E. Davidson
Principal Investigator

January 1990

MONITORING COMMISSION FOR DESEGREGATION IMPLEMENTATION'S

OBSERVATIONAL ANALYSIS OF PROJECT CANAL: YEAR 1 (1988-89)

Mary E. Davidson, Principal Investigator
Norman R. Kurtz, Primary Consultant

January 1990

Prepared under the direction of
Mary E. Davidson, Principal Investigator,
Monitoring Commission for
Desegregation Implementation
Chicago Public Schools
Chicago, Illinois

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

ORIENTATION TRAINING FOR CORE PLANNING TEAMS 3

- Introduction 3
- Assessment of Participant Involvement 5
- Assessment of Presentations 6
- Assessment of Group Sessions 10
- Assessment of Training Materials 12
- Assessment of the Educational Environment 13
- Summary 15

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING TRAINING: DAY 1 17

- Introduction 17
- Assessment of Participant Involvement 18
- Assessment of Presentations 20
- Assessment of Group Sessions 22
- Assessment of Training Materials 24
- Assessment of the Educational Environment 25
- Summary 27

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING TRAINING: DAY 2 29

- Introduction 29
- Assessment of Participant Involvement 29
- Assessment of Presentations 31
- Assessment of Group Sessions 33
- Assessment of Training Materials 37
- Assessment of the Educational Environment 37
- Summary 37

TOTAL SITE TRAINING 39
Introduction 39
Assessment of Participant Involvement 46
Assessment of Presentation 47
Assessment of Group Sessions 59
Assessment of Training Materials 64
Assessment of the Educational Environment 64
Summary 69
OTHER TRAINING ACTIVITIES 74
SUMMARY 75

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 - Core Planning Team Orientation
Assessment of Participant Involvement 7

Table 2 - Core Planning Team Orientations
Assessment of Presentations 9

Table 3 - Core Planning Team Orientation
Assessment of Group Sessions. 11

Table 4 - Core Planning Team Orientation
Assessment of Training Materials. 14

Table 5 - Core Planning Team Orientation
Assessment of the Educational Environment 16

Table 6 - School-Based Management/Shared
Decision-Making Training: Day 1
Assessment of Participant Involvement. 19

Table 7 - School-Based Management/Shared
Decision-Making Training: Day 1
Assessment of Presentations. 21

Table 8 - School-Based Management/Shared
Decision-Making Training: Day 1
Assessment of Group Sessions 23

Table 9 - School-Based Management/Shared
Decision-Making Training: Day 1
Assessment of Training Materials 26

Table 10 - School-Based Management/Shared
Decision-Making Training: Day 1
Assessment of the Educational Environment 28

Table 11 - School-Based Management/Shared
Decision-Making Training: Day 2
Assessment of Participant Involvement 30

Table 12 - School-Based Management/Shared
Decision-Making Training: Day 2
Assessment of Presentations 32

Table 13 - School-Based Management/Shared Decision-Making Training: Day 2 Assessment of Group Sessions. 34

Table 14 - School-Based Management/Shared Decision-Making Training: Day 2 Assessment of Training Materials. 36

Table 15 - School-Based Management/Shared Decision-Making Training: Day 2 Assessment of the Educational Environment 38

Table 16 - School-Based Management/Shared Decision-Making Training: Total Site Training Assessment of Participant Involvement 41

Table 17 - School-Based Management/Shared Decision-Making: Total Site Training Topics and Presenters 48

Table 18 - School-Based Management/Shared Decision-Making: Total Site Training Assessment of Presentations 55

Table 19 - School-Based Management/Shared Decision-Making: Total Site Training Assessment of Group Sessions. 60

Table 20 - School-Based Management/Shared Decision-Making: Total Site Training Assessment of Training Materials 65

Table 21 - School-Based Management/Shared Decision-Making: Total Site Training Assessment of the Educational Environment 70

INTRODUCTION

The following is an analysis of observations made by the Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation staff of the training activities during the first year of Project CANAL. Project CANAL was predicated on the assumption that the best way to raise the achievement of minority students in racially identifiable schools was to develop a model for cooperative planning and school governance at the local school level that involved principals, teachers, ancillary staff, students, parents, and key representatives of the community.

Based on school-based management and shared decision-making concepts, the model was organized around a core planning team made up of the various school and community constituencies that the school serves. The core planning team was to represent a nucleus of leaders in each school that was to lead the way in developing and implementing a school improvement plan that would improve levels of academic achievement. More specifically, the Settlement Fund Proposal described the core planning team's role as follows:

> Each participating school will form a core planning team that will be responsible for developing, managing, implementing, and evaluating a school improvement plan designed to meet the specific educational needs of their students. The core planning team will be responsible for utilizing the principles of school based management and shared governance to facilitate activities that will make the school improvement plan a reality.[1]

The importance of the core planning team as a representative body of the school community was captured in the following Proposal description:

---

[1] Creating A New Approach To Learning, Settlement Fund Proposal, Approved April 13, 1988, Board Reports 88-0413-RS1 and 88-0413-ED1, p. 2.

> Members of the core planning team will be responsible for reporting to and receiving recommendations from the groups they represent during each phase of the school improvement plan to insure that every segment of the school population takes an active part in creating a school environment that provides an opportunity for students to maximize their potential.[2]

The observations that formed the basis of this report were of CANAL training activities developed to prepare core planning teams to initiate school-based management in the local schools. The observational evaluation was part of the Monitoring Commission's responsibility to monitor the implementation of CANAL. The purpose of the observational study was to report on the character and quality of the implementation and did not include an assessment of the quality or appropriateness of the content of the training curriculum.

The specific observational activities of CANAL reported here include Orientation, School-Based Management/Shared Decision-making: Day 1, School-Based Management/Shared Decision-making: Day 2, and Total Site sessions.

Whereas, Orientation, Day 1 and 2 training were provided to core planning team members of each CANAL school. Total Site sessions involved training for the school staff as well as its core planning team.

Other training activities that were observed included sessions for: school-based evaluators, principals, parents, and CANAL Advisory Committee meetings as well as other sessions for core planning teams. In addition, Monitoring Commission staff observed the preparation of a cadre of substitute teachers who moved from school to school to relieve teachers and staff while they were participating in Total Site training.

---

[2] Ibid, p. 3.

The observations included monitoring the training of the cadre as well as their actual performance as substitutes in the participating schools.

Observers of training activities were provided with a semi-structured guide for recording their observations. The structured guide conformed to the categories used for evaluating training activities and reported in the tables. The recorded data of the observers was evaluated by independent raters resulting in the data displayed in the tables. The general rule was that rating of "poor" was not given unless the observers recorded examples substantiating a poor rating. Likewise, ratings of good were given only if observers noted some positive aspect that went beyond routine behavior. Thus, the interest was to rate training activities as average unless there was documentation for a "good" or "poor" rating.

Given the importance of the representational role of core planning teams for instituting school-based management, the composition of the team membership is critical as well as who actually took part in the training. The issues of composition and participation during Year 1 are addressed in detail in the Monitoring Commission's report, Year-End Progress Report of Monitoring Project CANAL Year 1: An Analysis of the Composition and Participation of Core Planning Team, January 1990.

ORIENTATION TRAINING FOR CORE PLANNING TEAMS

Introduction

The purpose of Orientation was to provide core planning team members with an overview of Project CANAL's purpose and goals, explain the core planning team's

role and introduce team members to skills enabling them to implement shared governance in their local schools.

The 41 CANAL schools (initially only 40 schools participated in that one school did not take part in CANAL training activities until after Day 2 training) were trained in one day sessions in groups of three to five teams. The one day training session consisted of two presentations in the morning which included a CANAL overview presented by CANAL staff, and a presentation by an outside consultant on interactive techniques that are useful for team building and shared governance processes. The content focused on the validity of different perceptions, and the value of understanding the views of others in developing a consensus decision model for school management. Orientation commenced on November 11, 1988, and ended on November 22, 1988.

In the afternoon, the core planning team of each school met separately to discuss specific problems in its school and put in practice the methods presented in the morning session. The day ended with a reassembly of the individual core planning teams where each team summarized their activities and achievements. Generally, the morning was used to provide core teams with content on team building skills while the afternoon was used to develop the skills related to the morning presentations.

The Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation staff attended Orientation sessions to monitor both the process and content of the training activities. Monitoring Commission staff observed nine of the sessions involving core planning teams of 30 schools. Three sessions involving teams from 10 schools were not monitored because of difficulties that the Monitoring Commission staff experienced in obtaining notice from CANAL of the scheduled training sessions.

The results of the observational monitoring included an assessment of participant involvement, the presentations, the afternoon group sessions, the materials used in the sessions, and the quality of the environment in which the training took place. A total of 12 orientation sessions were conducted in which 40 schools participated.

Assessment of Participant Involvement

Monitoring Commission staff evaluated participant involvement in terms of: (1) the representation of the constituencies on core planning teams anticipated by the CANAL proposal;[3] (2) the level of participation of the trainees in the sessions; (3) the personal conduct of the team members during training; and (4) the apparent level of satisfaction of the participants.

The observers rated the representation of attendees as average across all of the sessions. The evaluation was not based on an actual count of the extent to which the various categories of members on core teams were represented, but provided a judgement of the mix of individuals across the sessions. All of the sessions were rated as average indicating that the groups appeared to have similar compositions, as shown in Table 1.

Of those who did attend, what was the character of their participation in the training activities? Based on the observations of Monitoring Commission staff, participants engaged readily in the activities of the Orientation sessions. They were

---

[3] The assessment of representation here was based on the impressions observers had of the mix of individuals participating in a training session. For an analysis of the constituencies represented by the participants see the Monitoring Commission's Year-End Progress Report of Monitoring Project CANAL Year 1: An Analysis of the Composition and Participation of Core Planning Teams of Project CANAL, January 1990.

interested, often enthusiastic, and while on occasion they seemed determined to use the sessions to satisfy agendas unrelated to the training goals of Orientation, their genuine concern was apparent, Table 1. On a few occasions some of the parents were passive and did not participate in the process. When asked why, they indicated that they felt inadequate and did not think they could make a contribution to the discussion. The training staff made some effort to convince them that their ideas and information were an important part of the school-based management concept.

Most attendees displayed appropriate conduct during the training sessions, Table 1. However, during one session, a number of the attendees did not participate in the planned activities and were disruptive to the process. The trainers did not seem prepared to deal with the situation and a valuable training opportunity was compromised. Trainers should be prepared to anticipate such occurrences and reshape the process to allow the achievement of training goals.

The satisfaction level of attendees, as evidenced by their comments and responses to the training activities, was average. Most participants seemed to accept the Orientation training at face value and became personally involved in the training activities.

Assessment of Presentations

The observational analysis also was concerned with evaluating the character and quality of the presentations. The Orientation presentations began with CANAL staff describing Project CANAL and the concept of school-based management. This was followed by a consideration of various methods for developing skills in shared decision-making including the value and validity of differing perceptions of reality. Methods for

Table 1

CORE PLANNING TEAM ORIENTATION

ASSESSMENT OF PARTICIPANT INVOLVEMENT

Date And School	Representation			Participation			Conduct			Satisfaction		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
11/03/88 Bennett, Dett, Hammond, Howe		X			X			X			X	
11/07/88 Dyett, Terrell, Woodson		X			X			X			X	
11/09/88 DuBois, Dumas, Gale		X			X			X			X	
11/10/88 Byford, DePriest, Gregory, Mayo		X			X			X			X	
11/14/88 Bass, Goldblatt, Piccolo		X			X			X			X	
11/15/88 Fernwood, Guggenheim, Manierre, Williams		X			X			X			X	
11/16/88 DuSable		X				X		X			X	
11/21/88 Carter, Lafayette, Stowe		X			X				X		X	
11/22/88 Kelvyn Park, Orr, Robeson, Westinghouse		X			X			X			X	

engaging in a cooperative effort in face of individual differences among team members also were reviewed. Several different trainers were used across the sessions to present the skill building techniques. The various presenters had their own unique styles, used somewhat different materials and examples, and emphasized different things.

It is difficult to assess the impact of using different trainers on the Orientation process and on the teams. Thus, some core teams may have benefitted more given a particular presenter and presentation than others. Whatever the differential effects, the variation in trainers will make it impossible to assess the overall effects of the training. Evaluators will not be able to determine whether differences in core team outcomes and behaviors are a function of the variation in trainers or due to other effects. Trainer variation also will reduce substantially the capacity to replicate good outcomes and avoid undesirable ones in future applications.

The observational data included information on the qualifications of the presenters, the extent to which they were perceived to achieve their goals, their apparent level of preparation, and judgments on the overall effectiveness of their presentations, Table 2.

The individual presenters evidenced appropriate qualifications for their roles. They appeared to be skilled presenters and knowledgeable in their topic areas. However, perceptions of the extent to which presenters achieved the goals of the session varied somewhat as shown in Table 2. Most were rated as average in achieving the training goals, in one session they were rated as good, while in another the presenters were judged to have done a poor job. In the sessions in which the presentations were rated as poor, the trainers were diverted from the primary goal of the presentation to

Table 2

CORE PLANNING TEAM ORIENTATIONS

ASSESSMENT OF PRESENTATIONS

Date And School	Qualifications			Goal Achievement			Preparation			Effectiveness		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
11/03/88 Bennett, Dett, Hammond, Howe	X				X			X			X	
11/07/88 Dyett, Terrell, Woodson		X			X			X			X	
11/09/88 DuBois, Dumas, Gale	X				X		X			X		
11/10/88 Byford, DePriest, Gregory, Mayo	X			X				X		X		
11/14/88 Bass, Goldblatt, Piccolo		X			X				X		X	
11/15/88 Fernwood, Guggenheim, Manierre, Williams		X			X			X			X	
11/16/88 DuSable		X		X				X		X		
11/21/88 Carter, Lafayette, Stowe		X				X		X				X
11/22/88 Kelvyn Park, Orr, Robeson, Westinghouse		X			X			X			X	

other topics resulting in a disorganized discussion of topics that detracted from the training goals, Table 2. The extent to which the session goals were achieved appeared to be a function of the willingness of core team members to participate in the planned program, and the ability of the staff and the presenters to manage the audience to avoid diversion.

Most presenters appeared well prepared for their presentations. In one session, they were rated as exceptionally well prepared while in another, the preparation was judged as poor. Overall, the presentations were seen as effective, in three instances they were rated good and in one instance poor.

Assessment of Group Sessions

The afternoon group sessions were workshops that allowed the individual core teams the opportunity to apply and practice concepts to function as a team presented during the morning. At the end of the workshops, the groups reassembled to report on their afternoon activities. The group sessions were evaluated in terms of whether they achieved their goals, the reception of the group's reports by participants from other groups, the quality of the discussion and the quality of the effort of the group consultants or facilitators who were to assist the group process, Table 3.

Only one of the core teams of each session could be observed by Monitoring Commission staff. Thus, the evaluation of individual sessions for each day of training was based on the observation of only one of the three or four teams participating in the training on that particular day. In reading the table on assessment of group sessions, it must be kept in mind that the evaluations are based on the observation of only one core team per session.

Table 3

CORE PLANNING TEAM ORIENTATION

ASSESSMENT OF GROUP SESSIONS

Date And School	Goal Achievement			Reception By Participants			Quality			Consultant Availability		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
11/03/88 Bennett, Dett, Hammond, Howe		X			X			X				X
11/07/88 Dyett, Terrell, Woodson		X			X			X			X	
11/09/88 DuBois, Dumas, Gale	X			X			X			X		
11/10/88 Byford, DePriest, Gregory, Mayo	X			X			X			X		
11/14/88 Bass, Goldblatt, Piccolo		X			X			X				X
11/15/88 Fernwood, Guggenheim, Manierre, Williams	X			X			X			X		
11/16/88 DuSable	X			X			X			X		
11/21/88 Carter, Lafayette, Stowe		X			X			X				X
11/22/88 Kelvyn Park, Orr, Robeson, Westinghouse	Afternoon Sessions Were Not Monitored											

Most of the nine core teams observed by the evaluators satisfactorily achieved their objectives, Table 3. Four core teams that were observed were rated as good in goal achievement, while two were rated average. Another two of the nine teams that were observed failed to carry out their assignment because the members were unable to focus on the group task and the facilitators failed to provide the groups with sufficient and appropriate direction. The reception of the core team reports by the general assembly was again rated as good in four sessions, average in three and only poor in one. A review of Table 3 indicates that the group sessions involving the teams from Carter, Lafayette and Stowe appeared generally ineffective and were rated as poor across all assessment categories.

The overall quality of the workshop activity was rated as poor in three instances and good in only four. The training staff appeared to experience their greatest difficulties in dealing with the group activities during Orientation. The availability of consultants to help the groups was rated as good in only four of the sessions while it was poor in two, with the remaining three being average. The consultants did not seem to take management of the individual team processes seriously and often simply were not available to help team members understand the nature of the exercise or participate in the development of team process skills.

Assessment of Training Materials

Training materials are important to the success of any training venture. The materials for the orientation sessions were evaluated in terms of their appropriateness, quality, their application or use in the training session, and the extent to which the audience found them satisfactory, Table 4.

While the content of the materials appeared appropriate to the training session goals, the general quality of the material was marginal. The handouts to core planning team members contained multiple typing errors and misspellings. Often, the materials that were handed out were difficult to read because of the poor quality of the reproductions.

The use of blackboards and video materials was compromised by inappropriate placement, malfunctioning equipment, poor visibility to the audience, and poor preparation or inadequate attention to detail. While the quality of the training materials was poor, the trainers used the materials properly and the participants did not appear to have difficulty comprehending them. Satisfaction with the materials, however, was compromised by their poor quality, Table 4.

Given CANAL's emphasis on high standards of educational achievement for all students, it would seem appropriate that the training materials and activities of CANAL also should emphasize high standards. The professional quality of the training materials and attention to such detail by the CANAL staff is likely to have a major impact on the likelihood of the success of CANAL. Moreover, the standards set by CANAL are likely to carry a loud message to core planning teams and set the tone for improved achievement at the local school level.

Assessment of the Educational Environment

The physical environment in which training takes place is important as it should not interfere with training activities or goals. Aspects of the physical environment that were evaluated included general physical arrangements, the level of comfort in terms of temperature and air quality, and the noise level, Table 5.

Table 4

CORE PLANNING TEAM ORIENTATION

ASSESSMENT OF TRAINING MATERIALS

Date And School	Appropriateness			Quality			Application			Satisfaction		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
11/03/88 Bennett, Dett, Hammond, Howe	X			X			X			X		
11/07/88 Dyett, Terrell, Woodson	X			X			X			X		
11/09/88 DuBois, Dumas, Gale	X			X			X			X		
11/10/88 Byford, DePriest, Gregory, Mayo	X			X			X			X		
11/14/88 Bass, Goldblatt, Piccolo	X			X			X			X		
11/15/88 Fernwood, Guggenheim, Manierre, Williams	X			X			X			X		
11/16/88 DuSable	X			X			X			X		
11/21/88 Carter, Lafayette, Stowe	X			X			X			X		
11/22/88 Kelvyn Park, Orr, Robeson, Westinghouse	X			X			X			X		

The training environment left some to be desired and could only be judged as adequate. For example, the lecture and discussion sessions were held in an auditorium that was too large for the audience, and the seating arrangements were more suitable for watching a performance than generating group process. The seats were somewhat uncomfortable and trainees tended to scatter more widely than was useful for interactive teaching. Presenters also had some difficulty with regard to presentational space and arrangements. Thus, tables, podiums, chalkboards and video equipment were inadequate or inappropriately placed. This resulted in poor visibility to the audience or, in some cases, the failure of trainees to use training aids because of inconvenience.

However, the auditorium was either too hot or too cold depending upon the day of the week. The classrooms where the group sessions were held suffered from similar problems. The noise level also was within appropriate limits given that portions of the building were in the process of being renovated. The commotion of the renovations interfered somewhat with training and may have interfered with the activities of Orientation.

Summary

Orientation training represented the first major activity of Project CANAL and served as the period of initiation for the CANAL staff. The difficulty of inaugurating a program as ambitious as CANAL would anticipate a certain amount of confusion and some unexpected problems at the beginning. Nevertheless, the training process displayed some problems, as noted above, that may have major implications for the future of CANAL.

Table 5

CORE PLANNING TEAM ORIENTATION

ASSESSMENT OF THE EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT

Date And School	Physical Arrangements			Comfort Level			Noise Level		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
11/03/88 Bennett, Dett, Hammond, Howe	X			X			X		
11/07/88 Dyett, Terrell, Woodson	X			X			X		
11/09/88 DuBois, Dumas, Gale	X			X			X		
11/10/88 Byford, DePriest, Gregory, Mayo	X			X			X		
11/14/88 Bass, Goldblatt, Piccolo	X			X			X		
11/15/88 Fernwood, Guggenheim, Manierre, Williams	X			X			X		
11/16/88 DuSable	X			X			X		
11/21/88 Carter, Lafayette, Stowe	X			X			X		
11/22/88 Kelvyn Park, Orr, Robeson, Westinghouse	X			X			X		

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING TRAINING: DAY 1

Introduction

The second phase of training for core planning teams, Day 1 training, was to build on the content of Orientation and assist the teams in understanding school-based management and develop skills in shared decision-making enabling them to function as management teams. The training focused on making participants aware of the importance of mindsets that can serve either to stifle or create new visions for the potential of a school. Thus, emphasis was placed on vision creation, human development skills, brainstorming new ideas, and the importance of the elements in the process of building consensus. The Nominal Group Technique was used to demonstrate the process of consensus building.

Day 1 sessions began November 29 and were completed December 13. Commission staff were present for all nine of Day 1 sessions involving 40 schools. The observations of Day 1 training were assessed in terms of the involvement of participants, the presentations, the afternoon group sessions, the educational materials and the educational environment.

Assessment of Participant Involvement

Participation involvement was evaluated in terms of their representation, their participation in the proceedings, the appropriateness of their conduct and the level of satisfaction they displayed.

On an observational basis, the representation of the various constituencies intended by the proposed core teams, was less than anticipated, Table 6. In five of the

sessions, it was rated as average while in four it was rated as poor. The poor ratings were based on the observation that most team members were teachers and the broader set of anticipated representatives were absent.

Those who attended Day 1 training did not appear to achieve the level of participation that they had anticipated and some were openly skeptical of CANAL's potential. In four of the sessions, observers rated participation as poor while only three sessions were rated as good, with the remaining two receiving a rating of average, Table 6. Sessions that exhibited higher levels of participation were those where training staff guided core team members through the skill building processes step by step.

During one of the Day 1 training sessions a parent was unable to speak English and could not take part because a translator was not available. Given the bilingual communities served by some of the CANAL schools, CANAL staff should have anticipated this problem.

The conduct of participants was also of marginal quality in some of the sessions. In as many as four sessions, participant conduct was rated as poor, while good conduct was exhibited in only two sessions, Table 6. The poor conduct was reflected in their reluctance to participate in the planned exercises, lack of attention to the training, and in some cases disruptive behaviors. The character of the participants' conduct perhaps was reflected in the modest level of satisfaction with the training that they displayed, Table 6. In only one instance was it rated as good while the remainder of the sessions were equally divided between ratings of average and poor.

Table 6

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING TRAINING: DAY 1

ASSESSMENT OF PARTICIPANT INVOLVEMENT

Date And School	Representation			Participation			Conduct			Satisfaction		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
11/29/88 DuBois, Dumas, Gale, Woodson		X			X			X				X
11/30/88 Bennett, Byford, DePriest, Howe		X		X			X				X	
11/02/88 Guggenheim, Manierre, Sherman, Terrell, Williams	X				X			X			X	
12/05/88 Carter, Clark, Frazier, Hughes, Spencer, Sumner	X				X			X			X	
12/06/88 Bass, Goldblatt, Lowell, Piccolo	X			X					X		X	
12/07/88 Bradwell, Cooper, Dett, Hearst, Stowe	X			X			X			X		
12/08/88 Dyett, Fernwood, Gregory, Hammond, Mayo, Moos	X				X				X			X
12/12/88 Kelvyn Park, Orr, Robeson, Westinghouse		X			X				X			X
12/13/88 DuSable, Lafayette		X			X				X			X

Assessment of Presentations

The presentations were assessed in terms of the presenters' qualifications, the extent to which they achieved their goals, their apparent level of preparation and their general effectiveness as presenters.

Their qualifications were assessed to be good overall, Table 7. However, as in Orientation, a variety of trainers/facilitators were used for the nine sessions. Obviously, some were more experienced in school-based management techniques and were much more effective as trainers than others. Trainers less conversant with the techniques of school-based management and shared decision-making tended to lose the audience early in the training process. The variation in the abilities of trainers meant that core teams were not exposed to the same quality of educational experience. The effect that this variation will have on the capabilities of core planning teams and on the success of CANAL is open to speculation. At the very least, it will make evaluation of the impact of CANAL difficult because variations in outcomes will not be distinguishable from variations in trainers.

As many as two of the nine sessions had their presentations rated as poor with regard to achieving the goals of the training, only two were rated as good, and the remaining five as average, Table 7. However, the presenters were rated as good or average with respect to their level of preparation and effectiveness as presenters. The problem in the perceived quality of training appeared to rest less on the quality of the presentation than on the interaction between presenters and participants.

Table 7

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING TRAINING: DAY 1

ASSESSMENT OF PRESENTATIONS

Date And School	Qualifications			Goal Achievement			Preparation			Effectiveness		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
11/29/88 DuBois, Dumas, Gale, Woodson	X				X		X				X	
11/30/88 Bennett, Byford, DePriest, Howe	X				X		X				X	
12/02/88 Guggenheim, Manierre, Sherman, Terrell, Williams	X				X		X				X	
12/05/88 Carter, Clark, Frazier, Hughes, Spencer, Sumner	X				X		X			X		
12/06/88 Bass, Goldblatt, Lowell, Piccolo	X				X		X				X	
12/07/88 Bradwell, Cooper, Dett, Hearst, Stowe	X			X			X			X		
12/08/88 Dyett, Fernwood, Gregory, Hammond, Mayo, Moos	X				X		X				X	
12/12/88 Kelvyn Park, Orr, Robeson, Westinghouse	X			X			X				X	
12/13/88 DuSable, Lafayette	X				X		X				X	

Assessment of Group Sessions

The morning presentations included training in the Nominal Group Technique which was used to provide core team members with consensus building skills in problem solving. The afternoon group sessions provided core planning teams with an opportunity to practice the Nominal Group Technique in preparation for their new role in school-based management.

The group workshops were evaluated in terms of whether they achieved their goals, the reception of the training activities by the participants, the perceived quality of the workshops and the availability of consultants or trainers to assist core teams carry out the exercises.

The importance of practicing shared decision-making skills was not reflected in the workshop evaluations. The extent to which workshop goals were achieved was rated as poor in as many as four of the nine observed sessions, Table 8. Only three were rated as good, with the remaining two seen as average. Reception of the workshop activities by participants closely paralleled the ratings of goal achievement. The four sessions that rated poorly with respect to achieving the goals also were rated as poor in terms of reception by participants. And, reception was rated as good in only two of the workshops, Table 8.

The practice opportunity was not given high marks for overall quality. Five of the sessions were rated for poor quality and in no instance was quality rated as good, Table 8. Several factors may have reduced the capacity of the afternoon work sessions in providing a more meaningful experience to core planning teams in consensus building. Perhaps, a central reason for the inadequacy of the group process was the failure of

Table 8

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING TRAINING: DAY 1

ASSESSMENT OF GROUP SESSIONS

Date And School	Goal Achievement			Reception By Participants			Quality			Consultant Availability		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
11/29/88 DuBois, Dumas, Gale, Woodson		X			X			X			X	
11/30/88 Bennett, Byford, DePriest, Howe		X			X			X			X	
12/02/88 Guggenheim, Manierre Sherman, Terrell, Williams	X			X				X		X		
12/05/88 Carter, Clark, Frazier, Hughes, Spencer, Sumner		X			X			X			X	
12/06/88 Bass, Goldblatt, Lowell, Piccolo	X				X			X			X	
12/07/88 Bradwell, Cooper, Dett, Hearst, Stowe	X			X				X		X		
12/08/88 Dyett, Fernwood, Gregory, Hammond, Mayo, Moos		X			X			X			X	
12/12/88 Kelvyn Park, Orr, Robeson, Westinghouse		X			X			X				X
12/13/88 DuSable, Lafayette		X			X			X			X	

consultants and trainers to assist the groups in carrying out the training exercises in the afternoon. In some instances, even when group leaders were present, they were unable to maintain focus on consensus building, and the teams quickly gravitated to more traditional methods for problem solving, such as using majority vote rather than consensus building to resolve problems.

In other groups, the school principal dominated the session and discouraged group participation. There was a tendency for principals to take over if staff were not available to assist in implementing the intended skill building. As a consequence, the primary goal of the training, to assist a team in developing problem solving skills based on shared decision-making, was not achieved.

An important factor was the seeming failure of CANAL staff, consultants and trainers to anticipate the careful planning, structure and management that is necessary when using group activities for skill building. They did not seem prepared or committed to give the attention to the workshops that was required for skill building exercises. In addition, the staff failed to achieve a balance between giving the groups the freedom that is necessary to allow skill development while maintaining the control required to achieve the training activity mission. The tendency was to err on the side of giving the teams too much freedom and too little direction and assistance.

Assessment of Training Materials

As in Orientation, the training materials left much to be desired. Table 9 shows that the appropriateness of the materials was marginal. In four sessions it was rated as poor and in five as average. The perception of appropriateness perhaps, was influenced by the poor quality of the materials. The handouts contained multiple spelling and

punctuation errors and were difficult to read because of poor reproduction. In all sessions, the materials were given a poor rating, Table 9.

A videotape used in the presentations was of poor quality and in poor condition. The tape glitched at every session, causing delays and disrupting the continuity of the training experience. Initially, only one television monitor was available for viewing. It was placed on a low table, making it difficult for the audience in the large auditorium to view the video. In later sessions, a second monitor was added and both were placed up on the stage, making viewing easier. The agenda for each training session listed a video that was never used because of insufficient time.

The poor quality of the written materials and inappropriate use of video equipment suggests a continued lack of attention to detail in organizing the training program. Such inattention has a dramatic negative effect on the overall training process. Moreover, the message to core planning team members contrasts with the purpose of CANAL, which is to develop and maintain high standards for achievement.

Given the poor quality of the training materials, the trainers used them adequately. Application of materials was judged as average in all sessions but one where it was rated as poor, Table 9. It comes as no surprise that the satisfaction of participants with the materials was moderate at best. In three sessions it was rated as poor, Table 9, and it was good in only one session. The inadequate quality of the materials directly affected those receiving the training.

Assessment of the Educational Environment

Each training session involved from more than 60 to almost 100 participants, and for the most part, the training took place in a large auditorium. The seating and

Table 9

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING TRAINING: DAY 1

ASSESSMENT OF TRAINING MATERIALS

Date And School	Appropriateness			Quality			Application			Satisfaction		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
11/29/88 DuBois, Dumas, Gale, Woodson		X			X			X			X	
11/30/88 Bennett, Byford, DePriest, Howe		X			X			X			X	
12/02/88 Guggenheim, Manierre Sherman, Terrell, Williams		X			X			X			X	
12/05/88 Carter, Clark, Frazier, Hughes, Spencer, Sumner		X			X			X			X	
12/06/88 Bass, Goldblatt, Lowell, Piccolo	X				X			X			X	
12/07/88 Bradwell, Cooper, Dett, Hearst, Stowe	X				X			X			X	
12/08/88 Dyett, Fernwood, Gregory, Hammond, Mayo, Moos	X				X			X			X	
12/12/88 Kelvyn Park, Orr, Robeson, Westinghouse	X				X			X			X	
12/13/88 DuSable, Lafayette	X				X			X			X	

acoustics made it difficult for participants to see and hear what was taking place. Thus, the physical arrangements were less than satisfactory. In six instances they were rated as poor, and average in the remaining three, Table 10. Given that all sessions took place in the same environment, the differences in evaluation were a function of the manner in which the physical space was used by the staff and presenters.

Insufficient attention was given to technical arrangements. Room temperature was a problem; so the auditorium was either too hot or too cold, interfering with the flow of the training activities, Table 10. On several occasions an intruder entered the group sessions, displayed disruptive behavior and had to be ejected. Noise, from a variety of sources also became a problem during the training sessions, Table 10. While such problems may be difficult to anticipate and prevent, they should all be addressed with dispatch once they occur.

Summary

Day 1 of the School-based Management/Shared Decision-Making training was intended to provide core planning teams with the necessary skills to assume their leadership role in school management anticipated for them by Project CANAL.

For the most part, the sessions were barely adequate and did not display high professional standards for training that should have been available to core planning teams. In part, the inadequacies noted in the foregoing analysis may account for some of the cynicism expressed by participants regarding the potential of CANAL. Teachers, in particular, were concerned that CANAL was just another burden placed on their shoulders, adding to their already heavy workload as educators. Other team members openly expressed doubts during the group sessions about the utility of the program.

Table 10

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING TRAINING: DAY 1

ASSESSMENT OF THE EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT

Date And School	Physical Arrangements			Comfort Level			Noise Level		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
11/29/88 DuBois, Dumas, Gale, Woodson		X			X			X	
11/30/88 Byford, Bennett, Howe, DePriest		X			X			X	
12/02/88 Guggenheim, Manierre, Sherman, Terrell, Williams		X			X			X	
12/05/88 Carter, Clark, Frazier, Hughes, Sumner, Spencer		X			X			X	
12/06/88 Bass, Goldblatt, Lowell, Piccolo		X			X			X	
12/07/88 Bradwell, Cooper, Dett, Hearst, Stowe	X				X			X	
12/08/88 Dyett, Fernwood, Gregory, Hammond, Mayo, Moos	X				X		X		
12/12/88 Kelvyn Park, Orr, Robeson, Westinghouse		X			X		X		
12/13/88 DuSable, Lafayette	X				X		X		

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING TRAINING: DAY 2

Introduction

Day 2 training in school-based management and shared decision-making, which began on December 14, 1988, and ended on January 17, 1989, was a continuation of the training initiated by Day 1 training. The specific purpose for Day 2 was to develop further the school-based management and shared decision-making skills of core teams and train them to motivate the entire school community to participate in improving the quality of education.

Nine sessions were used to train core teams of the 40 participating schools. However, due to lack of notification of training schedules, Monitoring Commission staff were able to attend only five of the Day 2 sessions. The five sessions that were observed represented 21 of the 40 schools.

The training activities were evaluated by observers from the Monitoring Commission with the same categories that were used for the Day 1 evaluations: assessment of participants, presentations, group sessions, training materials, and the quality of the educational environment.

Assessment of Participant Involvement

The representation of core teams was rated as poor for all five sessions that were observed, Table 11. The poor ratings were due to the failure of core planning teams to represent the mix of constituencies required in the CANAL proposal. Thus, most core planning teams had no representatives from the community, very few parents, and a poor showing of ancillary school staff.

Table 11

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING TRAINING: DAY 2

ASSESSMENT OF PARTICIPANT INVOLVEMENT

Date And School	Representation			Participation			Conduct			Satisfaction		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
12/14/88 Bennett, Byford, DePriest, Howe		X			X			X			X	
12/19/88 Carter, Clark, Frazier, Hughes, Spencer, Sumner		X			X			X			X	
12/20/88 DuBois, Dumas, Gale, Guggenheim		X			X			X			X	
12/21/88 Bradwell, Cooper, Dett, Hearst, Stowe		X			X			X			X	
1/17/89 DuSable, Lafayette		X			X			X			X	

Those members of core teams who did attend, predominantly teachers, were willing to participate in the process. Three of the teams were rated as good with respect to participation, one was rated as average, and only one as poor, Table 11. The conduct and level of satisfaction was rated as good in three of the sessions, average in one, and poor in one. Except for the one session, which was rated poor across all categories of participant involvement, the ratings were satisfactory, indicating that the attendees were positively inclined towards CANAL, Table 11. The willingness of participants, however, was overshadowed by the poor representation of the constituents who were envisioned by the CANAL proposal as the key to the shared governance process.

Each Day 2 session closed with an exercise that had members of core planning teams arrive at consensus on how they could bring joy to their school on the following morning. The purpose of the closing effort was to assist team members in using consensus building skills to develop a way of improving the climate in their schools. The exercise met with great success and brought the training session to a close on a positive and enthusiastic note.

Assessment of Presentations

The qualifications of the presenters for Day 2 training were average in four sessions and good in the fifth. The extent to which they achieved their goals was also average as was the level of preparation and effectiveness, Table 12. Overall, the presentations were average and did not display any significant problems in and of themselves. Unfortunately, they were not reaching core teams originally intended by Project CANAL.

Table 12

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING TRAINING: DAY 2

ASSESSMENT OF PRESENTATIONS

Date And School	Qualifications			Goal Achievement			Preparation			Effectiveness		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
12/14/88 Bennett, Byford, DePriest, Howe	X			X			X			X		
12/19/88 Carter, Clark, Frazier, Hughes, Spencer, Sumner	X			X			X			X		
12/20/88 DuBois, Dumas, Gale, Guggenheim	X			X			X			X		
12/21/88 Bradwell, Cooper, Dett, Hearst, Stowe	X			X			X			X		
1/17/89 DuSable, Lafayette	X			X			X			X		

Assessment of Group Sessions

The group activities for Day 2, as in Orientation and Day 1 training, provided core planning teams with an opportunity to work together on shared decision-making, using vision creation and consensus building skills, Table 13. The afternoon workshops focused on the original theme: How can we make our school better? While most teams were able to come up with ideas on how to improve their schools, three were rated as good in this regard, and only one as poor, most teams did not apply the techniques of consensus building and shared decision-making. Some did not seem to possess the skills or knowledge necessary to initiate the process and neither trainers nor consultants were present to assist the groups. On the occasions when staff were present, they were not particularly effective in leading the groups. Thus, the overall quality of the workshops was rated as poor, Table 13.

In general, group activities suffered from the lack of hands on assistance and the instructive control that is so important to learning new skills. In some cases principals took control, in others, rather than go through the consensus building process, matters were resolved quickly by taking a vote. One group decided that they had enough training by the middle of the afternoon and left the training center prior to the conclusion of the day's training activities.

The decision of the one group to leave early reflected what appeared as an unresolved problem for CANAL staff. The CANAL concept emphasized the importance of autonomy for core planning teams because their perspectives were essential to improving the school. However, autonomy is predicated on the assumption that the teams have been trained to use appropriate group processes to solve problems. Too

Table 13

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING TRAINING: DAY 2

ASSESSMENT OF GROUP SESSIONS

Date And School	Goal Achievement			Reception By Participants			Quality			Consultant Availability		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
12/14/88 Bennett, Byford, DePriest, Howe			X			X			X			X
12/19/88 Carter, Clark, Frazier, Hughes, Spencer, Sumner		X			X				X		X	
12/20/88 DuBois, Dumas, Gale, Guggenheim	X			X					X	X		
12/21/88 Bradwell, Cooper, Dett, Hearst, Stowe	X			X					X	X		
1/17/89 DuSable, Lafayette*	X		X			X	X		X		XX	

*Group sessions for both schools were observed and assessed separately

much autonomy during the initial training phases and prior to the team's acquisition of skills necessary to engage in shared decision-making, may not be productive. In the early stages, the CANAL staff should have taken measures to assure that appropriate team skills were developed.

Again, with respect to autonomy, it must be kept in mind that core teams that showed up for training did not represent the broad-base of constituents envisioned by the CANAL model.[4] The members who did come for training were dominated by teachers and principals who, left alone, were likely to resort to "business as usual," and to arrive at conclusions using methods consonant with traditional behavior. This underscores the importance of close supervision during skill development by CANAL staff.

The responsibility for exercising control over core teams and assuring that CANAL resources were used as intended, rests on the shoulders of the Project CANAL staff. As pointed out earlier, the failure to produce core teams composed as dictated in the CANAL proposal, represented a major flaw in implementation. Allowing the teams too much freedom during the training process compounded the errors of team composition by allowing traditional school leaders, teachers and their principals, to dominate the teams.

Throughout Orientation, Day 1 and Day 2 sessions, the opening days of training suffered from poor organization on the part of the staff and apparent confusion about activities and processes. The group sessions were especially affected. It can only be

---

[4] See the Monitoring Commission's Year-End Progress Report of Monitoring Project CANAL Year 1: An Analysis of the Composition and Participation of Core Planning Teams, January 1990.

Table 14

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING TRAINING: DAY 2

ASSESSMENT OF TRAINING MATERIALS

Date And School	Appropriateness			Quality			Application			Satisfaction		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
12/14/88 Bennett, Byford, DePriest, Howe	X			X			X			X		
12/19/88 Carter, Clark, Frazier, Hughes, Spencer, Sumner	X			X			X			X		
12/20/88 DuBois, Dumas, Gale, Woodson	X			X			X			X		
12/21/88 Bradwell, Cooper, Dett, Hearst, Stowe	X			X			X			X		
1/17/89 DuSable, Lafayette	X			X			X			X		

concluded that core planning teams participating in early sessions received training that was of poorer quality than those who came later.

Assessment of Training Materials

The training materials used in Day 2 training were deemed appropriate for the sessions and no particular problems were noted, Table 14. The quality of the materials was average as was their application and level of satisfaction. The problems of quality in materials noted in Orientation and Day 1 sessions were dealt with more effectively in Day 2.

Assessment of the Educational Environment

The environment continued to be a problem. Temperature fluctuations were not remedied, and noise continued to interfere with the proceedings in one session. At best, the environment was rated as average, Table 15. Given the resources available through CANAL funding, it is not clear why environmental issues were not dealt with more successfully.

Summary

Day 2 training was in keeping with the preceding sessions. The overall quality of Day 2 training was on the level of an average performance. The more cogent issue was the failure of core planning teams to represent the constituencies necessary for school-based management. Whether the quality of the training would have been improved by the presence of the intended core planning teams is difficult to judge.

Table 15

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING TRAINING: DAY 2

ASSESSMENT OF THE EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT

Date And School	Physical Arrangements			Comfort Level			Noise Level		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
12/14/88 Bennett, Byford, DePriest, Howe	X			X			X		
12/19/88 Carter, Clark, Frazier, Hughes, Spencer, Sumner	X			X			X		
12/20/88 DuBois, Dumas, Gale, Guggenheim	X			X			X		
12/21/88 Bradwell, Cooper, Dett, Hearst, Stowe	X			X			X		
1/17/89 DuSable, Lafayette		X			X			X	

TOTAL SITE TRAINING

Introduction

While core planning teams were the focus of training in Orientation, Day 1 and Day 2 training, the purpose of Total Site training was to present the concepts of school-based management and shared decision-making to the broader audience of teachers and staff of the core planning team's school. Total Site training sessions were initiated on February 24, 1989, with the Jungman School and completed on May 30, 1989. The trainees should have included all of the teachers and key administrators of the school as well as the members of core planning teams including ancillary school staff (engineers, lunchroom managers, clerks, and teachers' aides), parents, and the members of the community. Each core team and its school received one day of training.

The training sessions were held during a regular school day. While teachers and staff were at the training center, their regular school duties were taken over by a cadre of substitute teachers and staff who had been trained for the role in advance by CANAL.

While each of the 41 schools in CANAL were to take part in Total Site Training, according to Monitoring Commission records and information received from CANAL, only 35 schools actually participated. Two of the six schools appeared on the training schedule of CANAL but records were not available to substantiate that they actually attended. Another four schools never appeared on the training schedule. Requests to CANAL staff for information on the schools failed to produce documentation that the six schools took part in Total Site training. Table 16 shows the 35 schools that participated in CANAL. Schools for which we have no record of participation in Total

Site training include: Hammond, Hearst, Kelvyn Park, Orr, Robeson, and Westinghouse.

There were some additional discrepancies between attendance data provided in the May 31, 1989, Quarterly Report of CANAL and the documentation of Monitoring Commission staff. The CANAL report showed that only 33 individual schools participated, while Monitoring Commission staff recorded training sessions for 35 schools by May 30. In a discussion between CANAL and Monitoring Commission staff, it was resolved that 35 schools had actually received training.

Note, however, that there were more than 35 training sessions in that seven of the schools were divided into two or more groups with each group receiving training on different days. Monitoring Commission staff recorded 46 Total Site Training sessions. Again, there was a discrepancy with the CANAL report which showed that only 43 such sessions were held. A check of the data indicated that the number of sessions was actually 46.

Of the seven schools divided into more than one group for training, five schools consisted of two groups, one of three groups, and another of five groups, as shown in Table 16. While it appears that the size of the school may have played a role in whether a school was divided into more than one group, it was not consistently the case. Thus, Lafayette was divided into two groups, one of 35 and another of 34 participants, for a total of 69; and, Lowell consisted of two groups, one of 35 members and another of 29 for a total of 64. But other groups as large as 68 and one of 70 were trained in one session. Another school, DuSable, was trained in five separate groups consisting of 22, 18, 12, 16 and 12 members which represented some of the smallest groups trained.

Table 16

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING: TOTAL SITE TRAINING

ASSESSMENT OF PARTICIPANT INVOLVEMENT

Date And School	Representation			Participation			Conduct			Satisfaction		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
2/24/89 Jungman		X			X			X			X	
2/28/89 Lafayette (1 of 2)		X				X			X			X
3/01/89 Carter		X				X			X		X	
3/03/89 Terrell		X		X			X				X	
3/07/89 Lafayette (2 of 2)*		X										
3/08/89 Moos *		X										
3/09/89 Dett *		X										
3/10/89 Dyett *		X										
3/13/89 Frazier		X			X			X			X	
3/14/89 Woodson		X		X			X				X	
3/15/89 Sumner		X			X			X			X	
3/17/89 Byford		X		X			X				X	

* Not monitored by Commission staff.

Table 16 continued

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING: TOTAL SITE TRAINING

ASSESSMENT OF PARTICIPANT INVOLVEMENT

Date And School	Representation			Participation			Conduct			Satisfaction		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
3/21/89 Bennett		X		X			X			X		
3/22/89 DuBois		X			X			X			X	
3/27/89 Lowell (1 of 2)		X		X			X			X		
3/28/89 Goldblatt		X			X				X		X	
3/29/89 Hughes		X			X			X			X	
3/30/89 Manierre	X					X			X			X
3/31/89 Lowell (2 of 2)	X				X			X			X	
4/03/89 Bass *	X											
4/06/89 Stowe (1 of 2)		X				X			X			X
4/07/89 Dumas		X			X			X			X	
4/10/89 Stowe (2 of 2)		X				X			X			X
4/13/89 DePriest	X			X			X			X		

* Not monitored by Commission staff.

Table 16 continued

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING: TOTAL SITE TRAINING

ASSESSMENT OF PARTICIPANT INVOLVEMENT

Date And School	Representation			Participation			Conduct			Satisfaction		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
4/14/89 DuSable (1 of 5)*		X										
4/14/89 Gregory		X			X			X			X	
4/17/89 Sherman		X				X			X			X
4/17/89 DuSable (2 of 5)*		X										
4/18/89 Bradwell (1 of 2)		X			X			X			X	
4/19/89 Bradwell (2 of 2)		X				X			X			X
4/20/89 Cooper		X			X			X			X	
4/21/89 Guggenheim		X			X			X			X	
5/02/89 Williams		X			X			X			X	
5/03/89 DuSable (3 of 5)		X			X				X		X	
5/04/89 Gale		X			X			X			X	
5/04/89 DuSable (4 of 5)		X			X			X			X	

* Not monitored by Commission staff.

Table 16 continued

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING: TOTAL SITE TRAINING

ASSESSMENT OF PARTICIPANT INVOLVEMENT

Date And School		Representation			Participation			Conduct			Satisfaction		
		Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
5/05/89 Howe	(1 of 3)*		X										
5/09/89 DuSable	(5 of 5)		X			X			X			X	
5/15/89 Fernwood			X			X			X			X	
5/16/89 Piccolo	(1 of 2)		X			X			X			X	
5/17/89 Piccolo	(2 of 2)		X			X			X			X	
5/18/89 Mayo			X				X			X			X
5/23/89 Howe	(2 of 3)		X				X			X			X
5/24/89 Howe	(3 of 3)		X			X			X			X	
5/25/89 Spencer			X			X			X			X	
5/30/89 Clark			X			X			X			X	

* Not monitored by Commission staff.

Given that the purpose of the sessions was to provide the entire school community with training and experience in shared management and decision-making, separating schools into small groups must have worked against achieving the goal. Presumably, an important part of Total Site Training was to bring the core planning team together with the entire school staff. And, in part, the goal must have included allowing the teams to build on and use the skills acquired in previous training. Dividing the school into small groups clearly jeopardized even further the capacity of CANAL to train all core planning team members to work together.

The CANAL Quarterly Report provides no justification or explanation of why some schools were trained in small groups. Information should be provided that accounts for the different treatment accorded the seven schools and how the division into small groups may have impacted their capacity to achieve the goals of CANAL.

It also should be noted that for the first time Jungman School began to take part in training activities at Total Site training. It is not clear what was done to prepare the Jungman team for Total Site training given they had not taken part in Orientation, Day 1 and Day 2 training.

The Total Site Training sessions were observed by Monitoring Commission staff. Their evaluation of the proceedings was summarized with the categories used previously to evaluate CANAL training. They included an assessment of participant involvement, presentations, group sessions, training materials and the educational environment. Eight sessions of the 46 Total Site Training sessions were not monitored because schedules were not available to the Monitoring Commission staff in time to arrange observations.

Assessment of Participant Involvement

The representation of core team members at Total Site training was rated as poor in 37 of the 41 sessions, Table 16. The four rated as average were closest to having in attendance the broad constituency of representatives specified in the CANAL proposal. The teams continued to consist primarily of teachers and principals.[5]

The participation of attendees was rated as poor in as many as nine of 38 monitored sessions, Table 16. It was rated as good in nine sessions while the remaining 20 sessions were average. The results indicated that the involvement of participants was less positive and enthusiastic than would be expected. The modest level of participation appeared in part to be a function of the quality and organization of the presentation and the program, and the concentration and interest of the audience.

The conduct of attendees was rated poor in eleven sessions and good in only eight sessions, Table 16. The remaining 19 sessions produced average conduct. The poor ratings indicated that attendees did not engage in conduct appropriate to the setting, thereby reducing the quality of the training. In some instances, the participants were not cooperative, in others they engaged in side conversations and activities that were distracting, and others displayed a lack of interest in the proceedings. The results suggested that program design and presentational format must be looked at carefully to assess potential reasons for the problems in conduct.

---

[5] For a complete description of the representation of various constituencies see the Monitoring Commission's Year-End Progress Report of Monitoring Project CANAL Year 1: An Analysis of the Composition and Participation of Core Planning Teams, January 1990.

From an observational perspective, the general satisfaction of participants was neither particularly positive nor negative. In ten sessions satisfaction was rated as good while it was judged as poor in six, Table 16. The remaining 22 of the 38 sessions were rated as average in satisfaction. While an average level of satisfaction may seem acceptable, the ratings must be evaluated in terms of the context and purpose of the training activity. The training was to generate enthusiasm around processes essential for school-based management. The observational ratings indicate that the training fell short of generating widespread enthusiasm.

Assessment of Presentations

Similar to the previous training activities, the Total Site training was organized around a major presentation in the morning with workshops in the afternoon. The training was to provide core planning teams and the entire school staff with an opportunity to learn and practice the basics of school-based management and shared decision-making.

It was expected that each team would be exposed to similar content and materials. However, that was not the case; there was great variation in the topics. The titles of 43 of the 46 presentations that were made were available to Monitoring Commission staff. Table 17 shows that the presentations consisted of 26 unique titles. The different titles indicated a difference in the presentation's content.

Not only was there great variation in the titles of the presentations, but 12 different presenters were used across the 43 sessions. In four sessions, two presenters were used, Table 17. The presenters were outside consultants except for one who was from the Department of Research and Evaluation.

Table 17

SCHOOL BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING: TOTAL SITE TRAINING

TOPICS AND PRESENTERS

Date And School	Topic	Presenter
2/24/89 Jungman	The Vision Creation Process	Dr. Eric Witherspoon
2/28/89 Lafayette (1 of 2)	The School Improvement Process	Dr. Ray Golarz
3/1/89 Carter	School Based Management	Dr. Ray Golarz
3/3/89 Terrell	Building Ownership/Involvement	Dr. Eric Witherspoon
3/7/89 Lafayette (2 of 2)	The School Improvement Process	Dr. Ray Golarz
3/8/89 Moos	Shared Decision-making: The Process	Dr. Eric Witherspoon
3/9/89 Dett	Overcoming The Barriers	Dr. Jeanne Baxter
3/10/89 Dyett	If You Can Dream It, You Can Do It	Dr. Ray Golarz
3/13/89 Frazer	Why Vision And Consensus Building?	Dr. Eric Witherspoon
3/14/89 Woodson	Matching Test Results To Instructional Content	Dr. Frederick Rodgers
3/15/89 Sumner	Building Self-Esteem And Discipline	Dr. Jawanza Kunjufu

Table 17 continued

SCHOOL BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING: TOTAL SITE TRAINING

TOPICS AND PRESENTERS

Date And Schools	Topic	Presenter
3/17/89 Byford	Overcoming The Barriers	Dr. Jeanne Baxter
3/21/89 Bennett	Creating The Vision	Dr. Ray Golarz
3/22/89 DuBois	Whatever We Imagine	Dr. Ray Golarz
3/27/89 Lowell (1 of 2)	Creating The Vision, Planning For Tomorrow	Dr. Eric Witherspoon
3/28/89 Goldblatt	We Believe....	Dr. Ray Golarz Dr. Joahn Brown-Nash
3/29/89 Hughes	Creating The Vision, Planning For Tomorrow	Dr. Eric Witherspoon
3/30/89 Hannierre	Building Ownership	Dr. Michael Bakalis Dr. Eric Witherspoon
3/31/89 Lowell (2 of 2)	Creating The Vision, Planning For Tomorrow	Dr. Eric Witherspoon
4/3/89 Bass	One At A Time, Together	Dr. Eric Witherspoon
4/6/89 Stowe (1 of 2)	Creating The Vision	Dr. Eric Witherspoon

Table 17 continued

SCHOOL BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING: TOTAL SITE TRAINING
TOPICS AND PRESENTERS

Date And School	Topic	Presenter
4/7/89 Dumas	Moving The Building Blocks	Dr. Eric Witherspoon
4/10/89 Stowe (2 of 2)	Creating The Vision	Dr. Eric Witherspoon
4/13/89 DePriest	Building Our Vision	Dr. Ray Golarz
4/14/89 Dusable (1 of 5)	If You Think You Can, You're Right!	Ms. Geraldine Oberman
4/14/89 Gregory	The Metamorphosis Has Begun: Caterpillar To Butterfly	Dr. Kenneth Addison
4/17/89 Sherman	Consensus Building	Dr. Eric Witherspoon
4/17/89 Dusable (2 of 5)	If You Think You Can, You're Right!	Ms. Geraldine Oberman
4/18/89 Bradwell (1 of 2)	Team Building	Davis, Hernandez Associates
4/19/89 Bradwell (2 of 2)	Team Building	Davis, Hernandez Associates
4/20/89 Cooper	Creating The Vision	Dr. Tony Baez
4/21/89 Guggenheim	Framing Possibilities	Dr. William Schubert

Table 17 continued

SCHOOL BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING: TOTAL SITE TRAINING

TOPICS AND PRESENTERS

Date And School	Topic	Presenters
5/2/89 Williams	Shared Decision-Making Process	Dr. Eric Witherspoon
5/3/89 Dusable (3 of 5)	If You Think You Can, You're Right!	Ms. Geraldine Oberman
5/4/89 Gale	Shared Decision-Making Process	Dr. Ray Golarz
5/4/89 Dusable (4 of 5)*		
5/5/89 Howe (1 of 3)	Team Building For Academic Achievement	Dr. Joahn Brown-Nash
5/9/89 Dusable (5 of 5)	If You Think You Can, You're Right!	Ms. Geraldine Oberman
5/15/89 Fernwood	The School Improvement Process	Dr. Eric Witherspoon Dr. Jeanne Baxter
5/16/89 Piccolo (1 of 2)	Building Student Self-Esteem	Dr. Jawanza Kunjufu
5/17/89 Piccolo (2 of 2)	Building Student Self-Esteem	Dr. Jawanza Kunjufu
5/18/89 Mayo *		

* Not available to the Commission.

Table 17 continued

SCHOOL BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING: TOTAL SITE TRAINING

TOPICS AND PRESENTERS

Date And School	Topic	Presenters
5/23/89 Howe (2 of 3)	Team Building For Academic Achievement	Dr. Joahn Brown-Nash
5/24/89 Howe (3 of 3)	Team Building For Academic Achievement	Dr. Joahn Brown-Nash
5/25/89 Spencer *		
5/30/89 Clark	Building Self-Esteem And Discipline	Dr. Jawanza Kunjufu Dr. Joahn Brown-Nash

* Not available to the Commission.

CANAL's Quarterly Report of May 31 indicated that CANAL staff individualized training to meet the needs of each school, but it is not clear how it was determined what the different needs were across the schools that related to learning the basics of school-based management. The Quarterly Report of May 31 stated that in several instances core planning teams decided who would present to them.

There is no explanation of why some teams were allowed to do this and how it added to or detracted from accomplishing the CANAL training mission. In these instances, the content of the training programs seemed to be a function of the CANAL staff's concern to allow individual schools and their core planning teams freedom to exercise preferences rather than that of maintaining a organized training experience.

Autonomy of core teams and their schools is important in terms of assessing the school's needs. However, providing core teams and their schools with the knowledge and skills necessary for school-based management and shared decision-making seems to be the CANAL staff's responsibility. It may have been more important for the CANAL staff to exercise control over content to assure that each school and its core team develop the knowledge and skills necessary to implement CANAL.

From an observational perspective, the variation in topics seemed more a function of the presenters' agenda and problems of scheduling sessions than implementing a well-planned training program. Whatever the cause of the variation, the confounding of trainers, topics, and schools, without clearly delineated criteria makes it impossible to assess the effects of CANAL or replicate the experience in other schools. This means that an important product of CANAL expenditures, assessing the capacity of the core planning teams to make a difference in educational achievement will not be realized.

The presenters' qualifications seemed appropriate given their topics. All were rated as either good or average, Table 18. However, the extent to which they achieved their goals was more questionable. In 13 instances, goal achievement was rated as poor and as good in only 16 instances. Given the wide range of topics and the variation in objectives, the judgement of goal achievement was difficult. The final assessment was based on an overall observational assessment of meeting the intent of the topic.

The presenters all seemed prepared for their particular topic, Table 18, but on some occasions the presentation did not fit the audience as well as it might have. For instance, one presenter, with apparent expertise in black culture, focused on the topic of developing self esteem in the context of the black experience. He ignored the fact that of equal concern to the audience were the problems of children with Hispanic backgrounds. When questioned on the matter, he stated that he did not feel qualified to address Hispanic cultural differences. The example illustrates the occasional lack of fit of the presentation to the audience. It suggests that CANAL staff did not do their homework in selecting or preparing their outside consultants.

The majority of sessions were rated as good in terms of reaching and engaging the audience. In 11 instances, effectiveness was rated as poor, in 15 cases it was rated as good and in the remaining 12 sessions it was average, Table 18.

A significant problem emerged when an outside consultant used the session as a forum for selling his own written materials. The consultant used training time to encourage and negotiate sales. While it might be argued that the material was suitable and useful to the audience, having a paid consultant take advantage of a captive audience to market personal materials seemed highly inappropriate. Even more

Table 18

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING: TOTAL SITE TRAINING

ASSESSMENT OF PRESENTATIONS

Date And School	Qualifications			Goal Achievement			Preparation			Effectiveness		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
2/24/89 Jungman	X			X			X			X		
2/28/89 Lafayette (1 of 2)	X				X			X				X
3/01/89 Carter	X				X			X				X
3/03/89 Terrell	X			X			X			X		
3/07/89 Lafayette (2 of 2)*												
3/08/89 Moos *												
3/09/89 Dett *												
3/10/89 Dyett *												
3/13/89 Frazier	X			X			X					X
3/14/89 Woodson		X			X				X			X
3/15/89 Sumner		X			X			X			X	
3/17/89 Byford	X			X			X			X		

* Not monitored by Commission staff.

Table 18 continued

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING: TOTAL SITE TRAINING

ASSESSMENT OF PRESENTATIONS

Date And School	Qualifications			Goal Achievement			Preparation			Effectiveness		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
3/21/89 Bennett	X			X			X			X		
3/22/89 DuBois	X			X			X			X		
3/27/89 Lowell (1 of 2)	X			X			X			X		
3/28/89 Goldblatt		X		X			X			X		
3/29/89 Hughes	X			X			X			X		
3/30/89 Manierre		X		X			X			X		
3/31/89 Lowell (2 of 2)	X				X		X			X		
4/03/89 Bass *												
4/06/89 Stowe	X			X			X			X		
4/07/89 Dumas	X				X		X					X
4/10/89 Stowe (2 of 2)	X				X		X					X
4/13/89 DePriest	X				X		X				X	

* Not monitored by Commission staff.

Table 18 continued

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING: TOTAL SITE TRAINING

ASSESSMENT OF PRESENTATIONS

Date And School	Qualifications			Goal Achievement			Preparation			Effectiveness		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
4/14/89 DuSable (1 of 5)*												
4/14/89 Gregory	X			X			X			X		
4/17/89 Sherman		X		X				X		X		
4/17/89 DuSable (2 of 5)*												
4/18/89 Bradwell (1 of 2)		X				X		X				X
4/19/89 Bradwell (2 of 2)		X				X			X			X
4/20/89 Cooper		X			X			X			X	
4/21/89 Guggenheim	X				X		X				X	
5/02/89 Williams	X			X			X			X		
5/03/89 DuSable (3 of 5)	X			X			X				X	
5/04/89 Gale	X				X		X				X	
5/04/89 DuSable (4 of 5)	X			X			X			X		

*Not monitored by Commission staff.

Table 18 continued

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING: TOTAL SITE TRAINING

ASSESSMENT OF PRESENTATIONS

Date And School		Qualifications			Goal Achievement			Preparation			Effectiveness		
		Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
5/05/89 Howe	(1 of 3)*												
5/09/89 DuSable	(5 of 5)		X			X			X			X	
5/15/89 Fernwood			X				X		X				X
5/16/89 Piccolo	(1 of 2)		X				X			X			X
5/17/89 Piccolo	(2 of 2)		X				X			X			X
5/18/89 Mayo		X			X			X			X		
5/23/89 Howe	(2 of 3)	X				X		X				X	
5/24/89 Howe	(3 of 3)	X				X		X				X	
5/25/89 Spencer		X					X	X				X	
5/30/89 Clark			X				X			X			X

* Not monitored by Commission staff.

inappropriate was CANAL staff's apparent consent to the activity in that it occurred on several occasions and nothing was done to stop it.

Assessment of Group Sessions

The group sessions provided core planning teams with an opportunity to work with teachers and staff of their schools in developing skills in school-based management and shared decision-making. The sessions were rated with respect to goal achievement, reception by the participants, quality of the activity and the availability of the consultants to assist in skill building, Table 19.

Goal achievement seemed adequate for most sessions. In nine of the 38 sessions, it was rated as poor because little progress was made on the assigned tasks. The reception of group activities also was adequate with only six sessions receiving a poor rating. The general quality of the group process was rated poor in as many as 10 of the 38 sessions and the availability of consultants to assist the groups was even more problematic in that it was rated poor in 17, Table 19. Thus, the failure of consultants to take the afternoon workshops seriously, persisted through Total Site training. Most groups were left to fend for themselves in the workshops.

Perhaps most noteworthy about the workshops was that the poor ratings tended to extend across all the rating categories of a school, Table 19. Thus, six schools were rated poor across all categories of group activities suggesting that the workshops clearly failed to meet their objectives.

The group sessions for Total Site training continued to indicated problems in terms of providing trainees with the opportunity to put concepts and ideas into practice.

Table 19

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING: TOTAL SITE TRAINING

ASSESSMENT OF GROUP SESSIONS

Date And School	Goal Achievement			Reception By Participants*			Quality			Consultant Availability		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
2/24/89 Jungman	X			X			X			X		
2/28/89 Lafayette (1 of 2)		X			X			X				X
3/01/89 Carter		X			X			X			X	
3/03/89 Terrell	X			X			X			X		
3/07/89 Lafayette (2 of 2)*												
3/08/89 Moos *												
3/09/89 Dett *												
3/10/89 Dyett *												
3/13/89 Frazier		X			X			X		X		
3/14/89 Woodson		X			X			X				X
3/15/89 Sumner		X			X			X			X	
3/17/89 Byford		X			X			X			X	

* Not monitored by Commission staff.

Table 19 continued

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING: TOTAL SITE TRAINING

ASSESSMENT OF GROUP SESSIONS

Date And School	Goal Achievement			Reception By Participants			Quality			Consultant Availability		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
3/21/89 Bennett		X			X			X			X	
3/22/89 DuBois			X		X				X			X
3/27/89 Lowell (1 of 2)		X			X			X				X
3/28/89 Goldblatt	X			X			X					X
3/29/89 Hughes		X			X			X			X	
3/30/89 Manierre			X			X			X		X	
3/31/89 Lowell (2 of 2)	X			X			X				X	
4/03/89 Bass *												
4/06/89 Stowe (1 of 2)		X			X			X				X
4/07/89 Dumas		X			X				X			X
4/10/89 Stowe (2 of 2)			X			X			X			X
4/13/89 DePriest		X			X			X			X	

* Not monitored by Commission staff.

Table 19 continued

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING: TOTAL SITE TRAINING

ASSESSMENT OF GROUP SESSIONS

Date And School	Goal Achievement			Reception By Participants			Quality			Consultant Availability		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
4/14/89 DuSable (1 of 5)*												
4/14/89 Gregory		X				X		X			X	
4/17/89 Sherman			X			X			X			X
4/17/89 DuSable (2 of 5)*												
4/18/89 Bradwell (1 of 2)		X			X			X			X	
4/19/89 Bradwell (2 of 2)			X			X			X			X
4/20/89 Cooper	X			X			X			X		
4/21/89 Guggenheim		X			X			X			X	
5/02/89 Williams			X			X			X			X
5/03/89 DuSable (3 of 5)		X			X			X			X	
5/04/89 Gale		X			X			X			X	
5/04/89 DuSable (4 of 5)		X			X			X				X

* Not monitored by Commission staff.

Table 19 continued

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING: TOTAL SITE TRAINING

ASSESSMENT OF GROUP SESSIONS

Date And School	Goal Achievement			Reception By Participants			Quality			Consultant Availability		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
5/05/89 Howe (1 of 3)*												
5/09/89 DuSable (5 of 5)		X			X				X			X
5/15/89 Fernwood		X			X			X				X
5/16/89 Piccolo (1 of 2)		X			X			X				X
5/17/89 Piccolo (2 of 2)		X			X			X			X	
5/18/89 Mayo	X				X			X			X	
5/23/89 Howe (2 of 3)			X		X				X			X
5/24/89 Howe (3 of 3)		X			X			X			X	
5/25/89 Spencer	X			X			X			X		
5/30/89 Clark			X			X			X			X

* Not monitored by Commission staff.

The level of positive response and enthusiasm necessary to support the dramatic change in management proposed by CANAL was not obvious in the observed sessions.

Assessment of Training Materials

Training materials were evaluated in terms of their appropriateness to the goals of the particular session, their general quality, their application and use, and the apparent level of satisfaction with them on part of the audience.

The materials across all sessions except six appeared appropriate, Table 20. In terms of quality, there was a marked improvement over the materials used for Orientation, Day 1 and Day 2 training. Some of the basic problems in preparation and production were resolved and in no instance were the materials rated as poor.

The observers felt, however, that the materials could have been applied more effectively. In some instances, materials were provided but not used and in others their potential was not realized. In as many as 11 of the 38 monitored sessions application was rated as poor and only 11 sessions received a good rating, Table 20. The level of satisfaction with the materials was acceptable in all but five of the sessions. While the ratings of the materials were not negative, it is expected that they should all have been very positive.

Assessment of the Educational Environment

The quality of the educational environment continued to present problems in the Total Site training sessions. In eight of the 38 observed sessions, the physical arrangements were rated as poor while they were rated as good in only one instance,

Table 20

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING: TOTAL SITE TRAINING

ASSESSMENT OF TRAINING MATERIALS

Date And School	Appropriateness			Quality			Application			Satisfaction		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
2/24/89 Jungman	X			X			X			X		
2/28/89 Lafayette (1 of 2)		X			X			X			X	
3/01/89 Carter			X		X				X			X
3/03/89 Terrell		X			X			X			X	
3/07/89 Lafayette (2 of 2)*												
3/08/89 Moos *												
3/09/89 Dett *												
3/10/89 Dyett *												
3/13/89 Frazier		X			X			X			X	
3/14/89 Woodson			X		X				X			X
3/15/89 Sumner		X			X			X			X	
3/17/89 Byford	X			X			X			X		

* Not monitored by Commission staff.

Table 20 continued

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING: TOTAL SITE TRAINING

ASSESSMENT OF TRAINING MATERIALS

Date And School	Appropriateness			Quality			Application			Satisfaction		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
3/21/89 Bennett	X			X			X			X		
3/22/89 DuBois		X			X			X			X	
3/27/89 Lowell (1 of 2)	X			X			X			X		
3/28/89 Goldblatt	X				X		X			X		
3/29/89 Hughes	X			X			X			X		
3/30/89 Manierre		X			X			X			X	
3/31/89 Lowell (2 of 2)	X			X			X				X	
4/03/89 Bass *												
4/06/89 Stowe (1 of 2)	X			X			X			X		
4/07/89 Dumas		X			X			X			X	
4/10/89 Stowe (2 of 2)		X			X			X				X
4/13/89 DePriest		X			X				X		X	

* Not monitored by Commission staff.

Table 20 continued

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING: TOTAL SITE TRAINING

ASSESSMENT OF TRAINING MATERIALS

Date And School		Appropriateness			Quality			Application			Satisfaction		
		Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
4/14/89 DuSable	(1 of 5)*												
4/14/89 Gregory		X			X			X			X		
4/17/89 Sherman		X			X			X			X		
4/17/89 DuSable	(2 of 5)*												
4/18/89 Bradwell	(1 of 2)		X		X				X			X	
4/19/89 Bradwell	(2 of 2)		X		X				X			X	
4/20/89 Cooper			X			X			X			X	
4/21/89 Guggenheim			X			X			X			X	
5/02/89 Williams		X			X			X			X		
5/03/89 DuSable	(3 of 5)		X			X			X			X	
5/04/89 Gale			X			X			X			X	
5/04/89 DuSable	(4 of 5)		X			X			X			X	

* Not monitored by Commission staff.

Table 20 continued

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING: TOTAL SITE TRAINING

ASSESSMENT OF TRAINING MATERIALS

Date And School	Appropriateness			Quality			Application			Satisfaction		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
5/05/89 Howe (1 of 3)*												
5/09/89 DuSable (5 of 5)		X			X			X			X	
5/15/89 Fernwood		X			X				X		X	
5/16/89 Piccolo (1 of 2)	X			X			X			X		
5/17/89 Piccolo (2 of 2)			X		X				X			X
5/18/89 Mayo		X			X			X			X	
5/23/89 Howe (2 of 3)			X		X				X			X
5/24/89 Howe (3 of 3)		X			X			X			X	
5/25/89 Spencer			X		X				X		X	
5/30/89 Clark		X			X				X		X	

* Not monitored by Commission staff.

Table 21. Given the substantial experience that CANAL staff had accumulated by the time of Total Site training, these problems should have been resolved.

The comfort level of the training site continued to present problems. In fourteen sessions comfort was rated as poor, while in no instance was it rated as good, Table 21. Inadequate control of such basic matters as room temperature interfered with the training activities. With regard to noise, matters were even worse for 22 sessions interrupted by noise from various sources, Table 21. Again, given the previous experience in the training site, these problems should no longer have been present.

Summary

The major problems noted in Orientation, and Day 1 and Day 2 training persisted during Total Site training. Total Site training involved entire schools and thus by definition the majority of the attendees were teachers. However, the proposed representation of school constituencies on core planning teams did not materialize. The lack of representation by parents and community members, and the modest representation of ancillary school staff continued to suggest that training was primarily oriented towards the teaching staff. More important, it signaled that CANAL was not yet able to put in place the core planning team that was to initiate school-based management through shared decision-making.

A further concern of Monitoring Commission observers was the variation in presenters and in topics. No rationale was provided for the variation. It seems that it may have resulted from CANAL's attempt to allow core planning teams to take an active role in assessing their own training needs. However, at this early phase of skill

Table 21

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING: TOTAL SITE TRAINING

ASSESSMENT OF THE EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT

Date And School	Physical Arrangements			Comfort Level			Noise Level		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
2/24/89 Jungman		X			X		X		
2/28/89 Lafayette (1 of 2)		X			X				X
3/01/89 Carter		X			X				X
3/03/89 Terrell		X				X		X	
3/07/89 Lafayette (2 of 2)*									
3/08/89 Moos *									
3/09/89 Dett *									
3/10/89 Dyett *									
3/13/89 Frazier		X			X				X
3/14/89 Woodson		X			X			X	
3/15/89 Sumner		X			X			X	
3/17/89 Byford		X			X			X	

* Not monitored by Commission staff.

Table 21 continued

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING: TOTAL SITE TRAINING

ASSESSMENT OF THE EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT

Date And School	Physical Arrangements			Comfort Level			Noise Level		
	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
3/21/89 Bennett		X			X			X	
3/22/89 DuBois		X			X			X	
3/27/89 Lowell (1 of 2)		X			X			X	
3/28/89 Goldblatt			X		X			X	
3/29/89 Hughes		X			X			X	
3/30/89 Manierre		X			X			X	
3/31/89 Lowell (2 of 2)		X			X			X	
4/03/89 Bass *									
4/06/89 Stowe (1 of 2)			X		X			X	
4/07/89 Dumas		X			X			X	
4/10/89 Stowe (2 of 2)		X			X			X	
4/13/89 DePriest		X			X			X	

* Not monitored by Commission staff.

Table 21 continued

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING: TOTAL SITE TRAINING

ASSESSMENT OF THE EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT

Date And School		Physical Arrangements			Comfort Level			Noise Level		
		Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
4/14/89 DuSable	(1 of 5)*									
4/14/89 Gregory			X			X				X
4/17/89 Sherman			X			X				X
4/17/89 DuSable	(2 of 5)*									
4/18/89 Bradwell	(1 of 2)		X			X			X	
4/19/89 Bradwell	(2 of 2)		X			X				X
4/20/89 Cooper			X			X				X
4/21/89 Guggenheim			X			X			X	
5/02/89 Williams			X			X				X
5/03/89 DuSable	(3 of 5)		X			X				X
5/04/89 Gale			X			X			X	
5/04/89 DuSable	(4 of 5)		X			X				X

*Not monitored by Commission staff.

Table 21 continued

SCHOOL-BASED MANAGEMENT/SHARED DECISION-MAKING: TOTAL SITE TRAINING

ASSESSMENT OF THE EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT

Date And School		Physical Arrangements			Comfort Level			Noise Level		
		Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor	Good	Average	Poor
5/05/89 Howe	(1 of 3)*									
5/09/89 DuSable	(5 of 5)		X			X			X	
5/15/89 Fernwood			X			X				X
5/16/89 Piccolo	(1 of 2)		X			X				X
5/17/89 Piccolo	(2 of 2)		X			X				X
5/18/89 Mayo				X		X		X		
5/23/89 Howe	(2 of 3)		X			X				X
5/24/89 Howe	(3 of 3)		X			X			X	
5/25/89 Spencer			X			X			X	
5/30/89 Clark			X			X				X

* Not monitored by Commission staff.

development, and particularly in the first serious encounter of core teams with the entire teaching staff, a more carefully controlled agenda would have been in order.

The division of some schools into two or more separate groups for training also required justification. It is not clear what the purpose was and how it will relate to the capacity of these schools to develop effective core planning teams.

Training continued to be confounded by problems that should have been resolved early in the program. The quality of the group sessions, the training materials and the training environment should have shown substantial improvement. Only the training materials improved to a point where they were evaluated as satisfactory.

OTHER TRAINING ACTIVITIES

CANAL engaged in a variety of training activities beyond those described above. While most of the sessions were observed by Monitoring Commission staff, only a brief summary of the character of the sessions and the participants will be included here.

CANAL conducted three training sessions for school-based evaluators observed by Monitoring Commission staff. The intent of evaluator training was to prepare an individual in each school to provide the core planning team with data and information essential for management and planning purposes.

Special training sessions also were held for principals covering a variety of subjects including the role of testing, the CANAL budget for participating schools, projected school improvement plan, and others. Monitoring Commission staff observed two principals' meetings in January, one in February, two in April, two in May, two in June and one in July.

Three sessions also were held to inform parents about Project CANAL and its impact on their school. Special meetings also were held with core planning teams. One was attended by Monitoring Commission staff in January, one in April, five in May and four in June. During June and July core planning team meetings were held to work on school improvement plans. The school improvement plan was the primary product that each core planning team was to produce by the end of the first year of CANAL. The evaluation of the character and quality of the school improvement plans in the 41 schools is analyzed in a separate Monitoring Commission report.

Additional sessions were held by CANAL in order to train teams of teachers and staff to substitute for schools participating in Total Site training. The substitute teams, called cadres, met twice for training during February and again once in April. The sessions were monitored by Monitoring Commission staff. In addition, the Monitoring Commission staff observed the effectiveness of the cadres in carrying out their substitute role. The observations were referred to as "shadowing" activities. Nine such shadowings took place in February, five in March, and four in April.

SUMMARY

The purpose of CANAL training was to prepare core planning teams to develop school-based management models in the local school and by the end of the first year develop a school improvement plan using shared decision-making processes. The purpose of the school improvement plans was to develop methods for instituting changes in the local schools that would contribute to the improvement of academic achievement.

The goal to improve the academic achievement of local schools was not unique to CANAL. What was unique to CANAL was the attempt to implement, across 41 schools, models for school-based management and shared decision-making. Core planning teams were the cornerstone of Project CANAL as they were to be the organizational vehicle for placing control and governance of local schools in the hands of the community. Thus, the CANAL proposal carefully specified the composition of core planning teams. They were to represent the primary constituents of the school including principals, teachers, ancillary staff, parents and community members. In addition, the original plan assumed that students, at least where high schools were involved, would play an active role in the process.

The initial purpose of the substantial investment of CANAL funds in training was predicated on the assumption that core planning teams could not be effective in implementing school-based management without special training. This special training focused on shared decision-making concepts and techniques. Shared decision-making, as a process, was seen as central to school-based management because it makes it possible for heterogeneous groups to combine their unique perspectives in solving problems.

Based on an observational evaluation of the training of core planning teams, the Monitoring Commission found that serious problems threatened the capacity of Project CANAL to meet the proposal's expectations. In summary, the following are some of the major problems identified by staff of the Monitoring Commission.

First, core planning teams failed to represent the intended constituency of the local schools in direct contradiction to the CANAL concept and the explicit intent of the Settlement Fund Proposal. Not only was the composition of core planning teams a

problem, but once training was underway attendance was even more problematic. A complete analysis of the problem of core planning team membership is provided in the Monitoring Commission's Year-End Progress Report of Monitoring Project CANAL Year 1: An Analysis of the Composition and Participation of Core Planning Teams, January 1990.

Second, substantial variation was introduced in the training both in terms of trainers and content. The variation will make it impossible to evaluate associations between CANAL outcomes and core team activities. For example, a number of different trainers were used. By reputation, some of the trainers were more skilled in the concepts that were to be taught than others. Moreover, different trainers emphasized different models, ideas and concepts, so teams were not exposed to the same kind or quality of training. The greatest variation occurred in Total Site training where trainers and content varied widely from one session to another.

It will not be possible to identify which lessons are to be learned from what. Moreover, it will not be possible to replicate the CANAL experience to other settings.

Third, the general state of readiness and preparation of the CANAL staff left much to be desired. At the beginning of each training sequence, Orientation, Day 1, Day 2 and Total Site training, consultants appeared unprepared, and the overall process of training in the first few sessions suffered from disorganization and inadequate preparation. Schools involved in the early sessions of each sequence were faced with training of lesser quality than those who came later. As it turned out, nine schools were involved in the early sessions of all three sequences, Bennett, Byford, Frazier, Howe,

Hughes, Sherman, Spencer, Sumner and Woodson. Likely, this will have an impact on the capacities of their core planning teams to offer the intended leadership.

Fourth, the group sessions that were to serve as workshops where core team members could apply concepts and develop skills for management and shared decision-making were the weakest part of the training program. From an observational perspective, it seemed that the CANAL staff and consultants did not appreciate the importance of their leadership in the workshop. Given the lack of dedicated leadership, much of the value of the group process in training was lost.

Fifth, there appeared to be a lack of clarity about who and how the training agenda was determined for core planning teams. While no explicit statement on the matter was available, it seemed that the CANAL staff allowed core teams considerable latitude in deciding what kind of training they needed. Clearly, the responsibility of assuring that team members received proper training and developed skills for leading their schools in developing an improvement plan, rested on the shoulders of the CANAL staff.

Sixth, the quality of the training materials did not meet ordinary professional standards. Inadequate editing, poor copies, video materials that were in bad repair, and inadequate effort to assure appropriate viewing and hearing of educational materials interfered with the training mission. Not only did these have a direct negative effect on the experience of the participants, but indirectly, they conveyed a message that was contrary to the CANAL goals of high standards for academic achievement.

Seventh, the quality of the environment was less than desirable. Poor control of room temperatures, noise and marginal acoustics compounded the use of a large

auditorium with fixed seating that was not well suited for interactive processes. The problems with the training environment persisted throughout the training activities reported here.

The observational evidence indicates that Project CANAL encountered serious problems in implementing CANAL. The concept around which CANAL was organized is not the issue. Nothing in the foregoing observational content suggests that school-based management through shared decision-making does not work. What the data shows is that the original model proposed in CANAL was not implemented. Therefore it will be impossible, based on the experience of Project CANAL, to determine what the utility of school-based management is for improving achievement. Hopefully, measures can be taken that will allow an appropriate implementation of the concept described in the original proposal.